

### REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed on April 22, 2004, claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Abadi. The limitations of claim 26 have been incorporated into independent claim 21. Thus, in view of this amendment, claim 26 has been cancelled. The § 102 rejections are discussed below in the corresponding sections.

#### Rejections of Claims 1-5:

The method of independent claim 1 includes generating security information to pass along with a data block. This security information identifies a security service to be performed with the data block. Furthermore, the method of independent claim 1 includes processing, in a computer peripheral device that is adapted to control communication with the communications channel, the data block according to the security information. A particular advantage of this arrangement is that data blocks may be tagged with the type of security service to be performed, thereby allowing the same circuit to perform multiple functions. Other and different advantages may be possible, depending on the particular embodiment of the invention. As an example, the security information may identify a particular encryption, decryption and/or authentication algorithm for use in processing the data block. *See, for example*, lines 18-24 on page 9 of the specification. Of course, in other embodiments of the invention, the security service may identify a different service.

Contrary to the limitations of independent claim 1, Abadi neither teaches nor even suggests generating security information to pass along with a data block, where the security information identifies a security service to perform with the data block. Therefore, Abadi neither teaches nor even suggests the generating and processing of independent claim 1. The Examiner refers to lines 28-35 and lines 47-63 in column 4 of Abadi. However, the cited language merely refers to the inclusion of a key in a transmitted data packet. This key, however, does not *identify* a particular security service to perform on the data packet. Thus, Abadi fails to teach all of the limitations of independent claim 1, and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 1 is requested.

Claims 2-5 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 6 and 7:

The method of independent claim 6 includes receiving data from a routine in a device, sending the data to a computer peripheral device to perform cryptographic processing of the data and after cryptographic processing, transmitting the processed data back to the routine.

Contrary to the limitations of independent claim 6, Abadi neither teaches nor even suggests after cryptographic processing of data that is received from a routine, transmitting the process data back to the routine. In the discussion of claim 6 in the Office Action, the Examiner does not address these limitations. Thus, Applicant requests the Examiner to specifically point out where the Examiner believes Abadi provides such a teaching. Otherwise, Applicant requests withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claim 6.

Claim 7 is patentable for at least the reason that this claim depends from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 8-10:

The method of independent claim 8 includes determining from a portion of data received from a transport medium if cryptographic processing of the data is to be employed.

Contrary to the limitations of independent claim 8, Abadi neither teaches nor even suggests determining from a portion of data from a transport medium if cryptographic processing of data is to be employed. The Examiner refers to lines 61-65 in column 3 and lines 24-27 in column 4 of Abadi to allegedly provide this teaching. However, referring to the cited language, lines 61-65 in column 3 of Abadi merely states that two hosts exchange encryption keys; and lines 24-27 in column 4 of Abadi provides the same general teaching. However, neither this cited language nor any other portion of Abadi teaches or suggests determining from a portion of data received from a transport medium if cryptographic processing of data is to be employed. Rather, such a selection or determination is not taught by Abadi. Therefore, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 8 is requested.

Claims 9 and 10 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 11 and 12:

The article of independent claim 11 includes a storage medium that contains instructions that when executed cause a system to identify a security service to be performed on data to be transmitted over a communications channel and prepare security control information to pass along with the data to a computer peripheral device to perform processing according to the identified security service.

See discussion of independent claim 1 above. In particular, Abadi neither teaches nor even suggests instructions to cause a system to prepare security control information to be passed along with data that identifies a security service. Thus, for at least this reason, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 11 is requested.

Claim 12 is patentable for at least the reason that this claim depends from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 13-15:

The article of independent claim 13 includes a storage medium that stores instructions to cause a system to determine from information in a data block that is received by a computer peripheral device if a security service has been performed on the data block by the computer peripheral device.

See discussion of independent claim 8 above. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion in Abadi regarding instructions that when executed cause a system to determine from information in a data block if a security service has been performed on the data block by a computer peripheral device. Without such a teaching, Abadi fails to disclose all of the limitations of independent claim 13. Thus, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 13 is requested.

Claims 14 and 15 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 16-20:

As amended, the controller of independent claim 16 includes a receiving circuit to receive data and associated security control information. This security control information identifies a security service to perform on the data.

See discussion of independent claim 1 above. In particular, Abadi fails to teach or even suggest a circuit to receive security control information that identifies a security service to be performed on data. Thus, for at least this reason, Abadi fails to teach the limitations of amended independent claim 16.

Claims 17-20 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 21-25 and 27:

The limitations of dependent claim 26 have been incorporated into independent claim 21. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection of claim 26 is addressed below.

The Examiner contends that the language found in lines 52-55 and 57-60 in column 5 of Abadi allegedly teaches a circuit that receives security data to identify if received data is subject to cryptographic processing. Referring to this cited language, the cited language merely discusses the reception of a data packet that refers to a decryption key. There is no disclosure, however, regarding a circuit to identify whether received data is subject to cryptographic processing. Thus, Abadi fails to teach all of the limitations of amended independent claim 21, and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 21 is requested.


Claims 22-25 and 27 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejections and a favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance are requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0182US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2004



---

Fred G. Pruner, Jr., Reg. No. 40,779  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, Texas 77024  
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]  
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]